64TH CONGRESS, 1st Session. | HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES. | REPORT No. 96.

TO AUDIT AND ADJUST CERTAIN CLAIMS OF THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA.

JANUARY 31, 1916.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. POU, from the Committee on Claims, submitted the following

REPORT.

[To accompany H. R. 3654.]

The Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3654) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to audit and adjust certain claims of the State of North Carolina, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass.

This bill authorizes and directs the proper accounting officers of the Treasury to examine and audit the claim of the State of North Carolina against the United States growing out of moneys expended by said State for military purposes in the war of 1812–1815 with Great Britain, applying upon such examination in the computation of interest the provisions and principles of the twelfth section of the act of March 3, 1857, entitled "An act making appropriations for certain civil expenses of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1858."

The main facts upon which this claim is predicated are susceptible of brief statement. During the war of 1812–1815 the various States expended certain moneys for military purposes. Whether wisely or unwisely, after many years the United States treated the sums thus expended as advanced to or spent for the benefit of the National Government, and therefore a debt payable with interest, and accordingly made refund, with interest. By the act of March 3, 1857, Congress directed a reexamination and readjustment of the account of Maryland, and declared that in the calculation of interest the following rule should be observed, to wit:

Interest shall be calculated up to the time of any payment made. To this interest the payment shall first be applied, and if it exceeds the interest due, the balance shall be applied to diminish the principal; if the payment falls short of the interest, the balance of interest shall not be added to the principal so as to produce interest.

2. Interest shall be allowed on such sums only on which the State either paid interest or lost interest by the transfer of an interest-bearing fund.

By the readjustment made under this act Maryland received an additional sum of $275,770.23.

On the 8th day of July, 1870, Congress passed an act directing that the accounts between the United States and Massachusetts and Maine be reopened and readjusted upon the same principle that controlled the readjustment with Maryland; and under this legislation there was paid to Massachusetts, for herself and Maine, the sum of $678,362.42.

Congress, by the act of June 12, 1858 (11 Stat. L., 326), enacted as follows:

> That the Secretary of the Treasury be instructed to report to Congress at its next regular session all applications made by State authority of the States and cities for the reopening and reexamination of the settlements heretofore made with such States and cities, and upon the principle of readjustment upon which said claims are based, and the amounts thereof; and the Secretary of the Treasury is further instructed to report to Congress at its next regular session the gross amount that will be required to pay such claims to the States and cities of the United States.

In obedience to the mandate of this act, the Secretary of the Treasury reported at the next session of Congress (see Executive Documents, second session, Thirty-fifth Congress, vol. 5) that claims had been made by certain States enumerated therein. The State of North Carolina was not included, as no application had then been made by State authority for the reexamination of North Carolina's claim, nor has the State been included as one of the many beneficiaries in the several refundment acts heretofore passed for the payment of claims of this character.

Acts for the refundment of claims of the character covered by the present bill have been passed in favor of the States specifically named therein, as follows:

Virginia, special act, March 3, 1825 (4 Stat. L., 132).
Maryland, special act, May 13, 1826 (4 Stat. L., 161).
Delaware, special act, May 20, 1826 (4 Stat. L., 175).
New York, special act, May 22, 1826 (4 Stat. L., 192).
Pennsylvania, special act, March 3, 1827 (4 Stat. L., 244).
South Carolina, special act, March 22, 1832 (4 Stat. L., 499).
Maryland, special act, March 3, 1857 (11 Stat. L., 229).
Massachusetts, Army appropriation, March 3, 1859 (11 Stat. L., 434).
Massachusetts, special act, July 8, 1870 (16 Stat. L., 197).
South Carolina, deficiency appropriation, March 3, 1903 (32 Stat. L., 1078).
New York, deficiency appropriation, February 27, 1906 (34 Stat. L., 29).
Pennsylvania deficiency appropriation, February 27, 1906 (34 Stat. L., 29).
Delaware, deficiency appropriation, May 30, 1908 (35 Stat. L., 516).

Your committee are unable to discover any reason resting in law or justice why the State of North Carolina should not be treated precisely as the States enumerated in the above acts were treated. The expenditures were made at the same time for the same patriotic purpose, and the relation of the States to each other under the Con-

stitution requires that as to reimbursement of principal and interest they should be treated alike.

The committee understands it to have been the policy of Congress not to allow interest to a State for advances made out of her treasury or out of funds raised by taxation. The only principle upon which interest seems to have been allowed to the States was by way of reimbursing the State where it borrowed the money advanced and paid interest thereon, or where it lost interest through raising the funds advanced or expended by the sale of interest-bearing securities owned by the State.

Upon this principle interest should be paid to those States only during the time that they actually paid interest.

There is appended hereto hearings had by a subcommittee of this committee on January 25, 1916, which is made a part of this report.

TO AUDIT AND ADJUST CERTAIN CLAIMS OF THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA.

SIXTH SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON CLAIMS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Tuesday, January 25, 1916.

The committee met at 10.30 a. m., Hon. Edward W. Pou (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Page, we will now hear from you.

STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT N. PAGE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, you are no doubt familiar with the bill I introduced, and the only explanation I care to make on the subject is as to why I introduced the bill and what it is intended to do, and then I shall ask Mr. McNeill to state the facts in the case. Some time during the last Congress the matter was brought to my attention by the authorities of North Carolina that during the War of 1812 various States in the Union as it then existed made certain advances in cash to the Federal Treasury, and that in the time elapsing all those States, with the exception of North Carolina—and there were 8 or 10 of them—as Mr. McNeill will tell you in detail, have been reimbursed by legislation in some amount, the amount having been determined by the Treasury Department. I can not determine, and I do not know that anybody can determine, the exact amounts that may be due to the State of North Carolina. It is evident, however, that no report has been made, and, not knowing this amount, in introducing this bill I merely ask that the Treasury Department be directed to render an accounting.

The CHAIRMAN. That it make an investigation now?

Mr. PAGE. Yes, sir; that is all; that the Treasury Department be required to render an accounting with regard to this as between the United States and the State of North Carolina, on account of these advances made in 1812, 1813, and 1814, during the progress of the war. There are other details in connection with it that Mr. McNeill, who is counsel for the State, will present to the committee, and I want to thank you for this hearing.

The CHAIRMAN. We will be pleased to hear from Mr. McNeill.

STATEMENT OF MR. ROBERT H. McNEILL, OF WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. McNEILL. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I think a brief statement of this matter will satisfy the committee that we ought to

have the relief we ask for in the bill, which is not that you pay the State of North Carolina any specific sum, but that her account against the Government of the United States simply be audited upon principles which the Government has followed in the accounting with all other States similarly situated. To make a complete showing in the record of this hearing of what the State contends for, I want to say that during the War of 1812 the several States then composing the Union were called upon by the United States to lend to the Government from their funds, either those in their treasuries or those they could borrow, certain moneys in proportion to the number of troops to be used in defense of the country. The various States of the then Union contributed more or less to these several funds. Some of the States were able to lend out of their surplus funds. Other States were compelled to borrow. Those loans were advanced between 1812 and 1816. North Carolina made loans, not in such large amounts as some of the other States, but in substantial amounts. North Carolina's loans to the Government, according to the records in the State Department, were $13,750 during the year 1814, $20,000 during the year 1815, $62,500 during the year 1816. All of those funds advanced by the State of North Carolina were borrowed from banks in the State of North Carolina, particularly from the State Bank of North Carolina, the Bank of New Berne, and the Bank of Cape Fear. Each of these loans was authorized by an act of the legislature, the outline of which I have before me, but which I will not put into the record unless the committee thinks it is necessary. If so, I will file a copy of this memorandum as an addenda to my remarks.

Mr. CAPSTICK. I think it would be a good idea.

The CHAIRMAN. You have a copy of the acts?

Mr. MCNEILL. We have full references to all of the acts and statement as to the purport of the acts, and I can extend my remarks so as to include a full reference to those acts, if that is thought preferable. Maybe I had better do it.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, the basis of this whole matter is the fact as to whether or not this money was actually advanced by the State. An act of the legislature authorizing the act to be done would be merely by way of corroboration; so suppose we leave it to Mr. McNeill and Mr. Sizer to decide how they will present the matter, and then we will decide later on whether we want that included in the record.

Mr. MCNEILL. These several acts of the legislature were immediately following her advancement of money, each of which loans were at the rate of 6 per cent per annum, borrowed by the State, and interest paid to these several banks. The various States, beginning directly after the expiration of this War of 1812, began to get refunds of amounts due them. North Carolina was refunded $30,000 on September 17, 1816; $17,000 on November 20, 1817; and $30,000 on June 10, 1837; a total of $77,000, as against the sum of $96,250 advanced. We believe that there is a deficiency in the return of the principal sum advanced by the State of North Carolina, but we will depend somewhat upon the view the accounting officers may take as to whether or not the $77,000 actually represents all which they are willing to allow as proper expenditures. But following the

payments back to the State of these principal sums, the real question which this bill is intended to cover arose; that is, the question whether or not the Government of the United States should pay interest on the sums advanced by the several States, to compensate the States for the interest they had paid on the moneys they had borrowed.

The Government has established, by probably 15 or 20 different precedents, which I shall recite, that it will pay interest on the sums advanced if the State lost interest on invested funds that were drawing interest, or if they borrowed money and paid interest thereon. In each of these two cases the Government has always followed the rule that it would reimburse the State for interest lost on invested capital or invested surplus, or if the State borrowed money and paid interest. I want to cite to the committee the various acts of Congress in which this repayment of interest has been audited to the States. With reference to the State of Virginia, the act was passed March 3, 1825, reauditing the accounts of that State on this subject, as shown by Fourth Statutes at Large, page 132; to the State of Maryland by act of May 13, 1846, as shown by Fourth Statutes at Large, page 161; to the State of Delaware by act of May 20, 1826, as shown by Fourth Statutes at Large, page 175; to the State of New York by act of May 22, 1826, as shown by Fourth Statutes at Large, page 192; to the State of Pennsylvania, by act of March 3, 1827, as shown by Fourth Statutes at Large, page 241; to the State of South Carolina by act of March 22, 1832, as shown by Fourth Statutes at Large, page 499; to the State of Maryland by act of March 3, 1857, as shown by Eleventh Statutes at Large, page 229; to the State of Massachusetts by the Army appropriation act of March 3, 1859, as shown by Eleventh Statutes at Large, page 434; as to Massachusetts, again by act of July 8, 1870, as shown in the Sixteenth Statutes at Large, page 197; as to South Carolina by deficiency appropriation act of March 3, 1903, as shown by Thirty-second Statutes at Large, page 1078; to the State of New York by the urgent deficiency appropriation act of February 27, 1906, as shown by Thirty-fourth Statutes at Large, page 29; to the State of Pennsylvania by urgent deficiency appropriation act of February 27, 1906, as shown by Thirty-fourth Statutes at Large, page 29; and to the State of Delaware by deficiency appropriation act of May 30, 1908, as shown by Thirty-fifth Statutes at Large, page 516.

The reason for the passage of most of these acts was based upon this proposition: The Government, in its first repayment of interest, repaid to the States interest on the theory that when the Government made an appropriation to pay back to the State a certain amount of money the interest was incurred up to the time of the partial payment. Then, instead of applying that payment by the Government to the payment of interest, or to the payment of interest pro tanto, it was applied as a payment on the principal, and not upon the accrued interest. The States thereafter objected to that method of settlement, and what was known as the Maryland rule was passed, which your committee will note is the rule laid down in the bill. That rule was announced by Chairman Warren, of the Senate Committee on Claims, which really is the rule that prevails

in all commercial and business transactions, that when a payment on a debt is made, it shall be applied first to the liquidation of interest charges and then the balance shall apply on the principal, the balance of the principal thereafter to be the interest-bearing fund. Instead of doing that they required the payments in all these cases to be applied upon the principal sum, thereby cutting down the interest-bearing fund proportionately, which was an unfair and unjust way to do it. Therefore in the preparation of this bill we provide that this matter shall be referred to the Treasury Department, and that the Secretary of the Treasury shall be directed to reopen, examine, and audit the claim of the State of North Carolina for and on account of advances and expenditures made by that State in the War of 1812 to 1815 with Great Britain and ascertain and determine, in accordance with the rule applied in the settlement of the like claim of the State of Maryland under the provisions of the act of Congress approved the 3d day of March, 1857, the amount remaining unpaid to the State of North Carolina on account of said advances and expenditures.

Mr. GOODWIN. What rate of interest did those acts authorize; or did they authorize the payment of interest? Was it the legal interest of the various States? Six per cent, I suppose?

Mr. MCNEILL. Yes, sir; 6 per cent is the legal rate. That was the rate paid by North Carolina.

Mr. CAPSTICK. That was the legal rate at that time?

Mr. MCNEILL. That was the legal rate at that time in the State of North Carolina, and I imagine it was in the other States.

Mr. GOODWIN. I believe 6 per cent is considered the legal rate throughout the country, in the absence of a contract?

Mr. MCNEILL. I believe so. The rule adopted, as set forth in the report submitted by Mr. Warren in 1902, analyzes first the fact that these returns of money have been made by the Government upon the plan I have outlined and then it announces that the principles to govern the future action of Congress, as declared by the act of March 3, 1857, in which Congress directed a reexamination and readjustment of the account of Maryland, shall be that interest shall be calculated up to the time of any payment made, and to this interest the payment shall first be applied, and if it exceeds the interest due, the balance shall be applied to diminish the principal; if the payment falls short of the interest, the balance of interest shall not be added to the principal so as to produce interest. That interest shall be allowed on such sums only on which the State either paid interest or lost interest by the transfer of an interest-bearing fund.

These various acts of Congress, reauditing these accounts, have passed into legislation, and under those acts the accounts of the States of Virginia, South Carolina, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, New York, Maryland, and Delaware—every State which advanced money to the United States, with the exception of North Carolina—have had their accounts reaudited in conformity with these exact principles, and so far as we have been able to determine by the most thorough search of the records of the Government, North Carolina is the only State which has never had this rule applied to her advancements to the Government. In 1858 an act of Congress was

passed directing the Treasury Department to report to Congress the names of those States which had filed claims for a reaudit of their accounts under the Maryland rule, the act being passed a year after the announcement of the Maryland rule. The Treasury Department, in conformity to that act, made the report to Congress as to the States which had filed application for refundments of money due them under the Maryland rule, but North Carolina, not having made application, was not included in that list. The States which were included in the list have long since come in for a readjustment of their accounts, and their accounts have been readjusted.

The inquiry is pertinent as to why North Carolina has never filed application for a reaudit of her claims. Up to 1837 there had been no reaudit under this Maryland principle. Until 1857 it had not been specifically enacted into law. When the act of 1858 was passed calling for a report from the Treasury Department of States which had applied for refund North Carolina, which had not been advised of this reaudit principle and which had not applied to the Treasury Department for such reaudit, was not included in the Secretary's report, and therefore the State of North Carolina had no official record upon which they could act. For the information of the committee I will say that it was not known to the Members from North Carolina that there was a possibility of this law existing until recent investigations of the old State and Government records disclosed the fact. That committee of Congress of which Mr. Warren was the chairman repeated the statement which was made when the Maryland act of 1857 was passed, that there was no reason why one State should be put upon one plane or principle and another State put upon a different plane or principle. Here is the language that committee used, and I think it is proper for the consideration of this committee:

> Your committee are unable to discover any reason resting in law or justice why the State of North Carolina should not be treated precisely as the States enumerated in the above acts were treated. The expenditures were made at the same time for the same patriotic purpose, and the relation of the States to each other under the Constitution requires that as to reimbursement of principal and interest they should be treated alike.

The CHAIRMAN. From what are you reading?

Mr. MCNEILL. From Mr. Warren's report, of the time the act of 1902 was passed, which is a repetition of the report of the committee which passed the Maryland act of 1857. Continuing, the report says:

> The committee understands it to have been the policy of Congress not to allow interest to a State for advances made out of her treasury or out of funds raised by taxation. The only principle upon which interest seems to have been allowed to the State was by way of reimbursing the State where it borrowed the money advanced and paid interest thereon, or where it lost interest through raising the funds advanced or expended by the sale of interest-bearing securities owned by the State. Upon this principle interest should be paid to those States only during the time that they actually paid interest.

To analyze the situation, gentlemen of the committee, here it is: There were about 10 States that loaned money to the Government. Under principles laid down by Congress in about 15 acts they have all been repaid, everything they lent, with interest, except the State of North Carolina, which by some perfectly natural failure to make a claim has been left outside and has not participated in this fund.

Mr. CAPSTICK. What is the amount of the principle due you at the present time?

Mr. MCNEILL. About $15,000.

Mr. CAPSTICK. What is the amount of the interest?

Mr. MCNEILL. The interest is a matter that depends so much upon the audit by the Government that I would not like to hazard an opinion. I can give you some relative figures that have been paid to other States. May I make one further observation: We are not asking that this committee pass a bill that gives us the money, but simply that it goes to the Treasury Department to reaudit under the rule that has been followed in every similar case. So far as I know, I have finished the statement, which I think ought to be sufficient, but I think Mr. Sizer has had these cases before, and has represented the States of New York and Illinois as an attorney, and he is here, and if there is any possible question that any member of the committee would like to ask, he is thoroughly familiar with them.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Sizer, we would like to hear from you.

STATEMENT OF MR. A. SIZER, OF WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. SIZER. I do not know that I can add anything to what Mr. McNeill has said, but if you gentlemen wish any information from me, I could get along faster if some of you would ask a question.

The CHAIRMAN. North Carolina has advanced $92,000 and has got back $77,000. The question is whether that $77,000 shall be applied upon the original principal or whether or not the interest shall be calculated up to the date of the repayment to the State of North Carolina, and then the interest canceled first, and a balance struck in that way. That is all there is to it, isn't it?

Mr. MCNEILL (interposing). Absolutely.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not suppose that there is a State in the Union that would permit of the cancellation of a debt by applying the repayment upon the principal first and then upon the interest afterwards. As I understood from Mr. McNeill, Mr. Sizer, in all of the settlements that have been made with the respective States that have advanced money to the Government, the settlements have been made upon the basis of the cancellation of the interest first, isn't that true?

Mr. SIZER. Yes, sir. If the committee so desire I might refer them to a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States on this particular question, which arose in the case of the State of New York *v.* The United States, and is reported in 160 United States Reports, page 598. Justice Harlan laid down the rule there that money expended for interest to acquire funds with which to purchase military equipment was just as much a part of the fund as the money expended for the military equipment.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Sizer, I would like to hear from you on two propositions. First, the committee would like to know whether or not the State of North Carolina paid interest itself on the amount that it advanced to the Government, and what evidence you have as to that. Secondly, we would like to know whether or not a bill similar to this bill was passed by Congress in settlements that have been had with other States.

Mr. SIZER. We have a transcript from the treasurer's books of North Carolina, which, however, has not been certified, which shows that the State borrowed from these banks this amount of money and paid this interest, and we have transcripts showing where the different interest repayments appear in the books. We will have that properly certified if the Treasury Department requires it. As to what has been done in respect to similar legislation, I might refer to more recent legislation. The act approved February 24, 1905, provided for the settlement of identically the same sort of claims—claims arising from the War of 1812—for the States of New York, Pennsylvania, and Delaware.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you put into the record copies of bills that were passed by Congress?

Mr. SIZER. You mean the act?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; the act of Congress.

Mr. SIZER. Yes; we have that here. A subsequent enactment was made by Congress for the State of Texas. That act was approved June 30, 1906. That was to make a report and certify to Congress certain expenditures incurred by the State of Texas on account of her rangers, about the years 1855 to 1860, I think. There was still another act of Congress passed March 4, 1907, in favor of the State of Minnesota, based on moneys she had borrowed to expend for suppressing Indian hostilities upon the border. There was still another act, approved March 4, 1909, for the State of Kansas. That was for the payment of interest and discount. The State of Kansas had to discount her bonds, so they paid not only the interest but the discount on money borrowed to suppress Indian hostilities. Those are perhaps the latest acts of Congress covering the subject matter of this class, but you will find a great many prior acts.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you give the committee the figures indicating the amounts paid by the respective States and the amounts that were paid back by the United States Government, including interest?

Mr. SIZER. I do not know that we have got that entirely separated, but here are the principal ones. I will give first the name of the State, then the principal amount, and then the interest: Virginia expended $1,807,420.06. She has been paid interest on that sum of $178,498.11. She got a very early interest settlement. South Carolina expended $155,000. She has been paid interest of $204,504.93. Massachusetts—and I might say included with Massachusetts is the State of Maine. Maine and Massachusetts were settled as one State. The principal sum for Massachusetts is $430,748.26, on which she received $679,418.08. Pennsylvania expended as principal $325,-791.80. She has received in interest $254,340.25. New York expended as principal $151,054.07. She has received as interest $158,850.70. Maryland expended as principal $295,648.03. She has received as interest $343,387.45. Delaware expended as principal $34,545.72, and she has received as interest $89,780.50.

The CHAIRMAN. All of those settlements were made in accordance with what is known as the Maryland rule?

Mr. SIZER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The cancellation of the interest first and the application of any excess to the principal?

Mr. SIZER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And the question that arises in this case is whether or not the United States Government owes the State of North Carolina approximately 100 years' interest?

Mr. SIZER. Yes, sir.

Mr. CAPSTICK. Do you know the rates of interest paid in the States of Massachusetts and Maine?

Mr. SIZER. I think it was 6 per cent. I do not know what the interest was in Pennsylvania. She sold bonds. Part of those bonds were at 6 per cent and part of them were at 5½ per cent. New York State paid 6 per cent.

Mr. CAPSTICK. The reason that I asked the question is that I know of transactions taking place in which the rate of interest is 10 per cent in the State of Massachusetts during the time I lived there, and I understood at that time that there was no limit as regards the rates of interest——

Mr. MCNEILL (interposing). The acts of North Carolina allowed the State to borrow at 6 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no doubt about the correctness of the figures of $92,000 advanced by the State of North Carolina.

Mr. MCNEILL (interposing). $96,250.

Mr. SIZER. I am inclined to believe that the Government has made what they consider to be a correct settlement in allowing $77,000, since the State may have, in her zeal to get troops in the field, incurred some expenditures the War Department would consider not a proper expense coming within the meaning of the reimbursement act. All the States did that, and I am inclined to believe the difference between the $77,000 and the $96,000 possibly represents some expenditures which may not have been for military purposes, and the accounting officers have, therefore, cut them out. The amount of the original claim which was paid back to the State is $77,000. I have my doubts about the balance between that and the sum expended by the State as representing the principal account, for the reason that the accounting officers have passed on that, making the determination that while it was a meritorious expense, it was not a legitimate expense against the United States.

Mr. MCNEILL. Mr. Chairman, just for your possible use we have prepared a little résumé of what we have said, and in the consideration of your report on this bill, if you can make some use of it——

The CHAIRMAN. We will be glad to incorporate in the record and have printed whatever you gentlemen consider is necessary to a full investigation of this matter. Is there anything else which you gentlemen wish to present this morning?

Mr. MCNEILL. I think that covers the case.

(Thereupon, at 11.15 a. m., the committee adjourned.)

O

64TH CONGRESS, 1st Session. } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES. { REPORT No. 95.

IMMIGRATION OF ALIENS INTO THE UNITED STATES.

JANUARY 31, 1916.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURNETT, from the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, submitted the following

REPORT.

[To accompany H. R. 10384.]

The Committee [illegible]ration and Naturalization, to which was referred the bill [illegible] regulate the immigration of aliens to and the reside[illegible]nited States, reports the same to the House, a[illegible] passed.

The bill re[illegible] present immigration laws. H[illegible]lments have been made to the [illegible]

The first [illegible]ine 14, an increase of the head [illegible]ted that the law is so change[illegible] accompanying their father or [illegible]om head tax. Under the pres[illegible]he arms of its mother, is requi[illegible]he committee thought, was ra[illegible] exempted children mentioned [illegible]

Th[illegible]ge 3, line 12. Under the pres[illegible] States after an uninterrup[illegible]mmediately preceding such en[illegible]Newfoundland, the Republic o[illegible] are exempted entirely from he[illegible]o remain permanently. This bill re[illegible]s all countries on a plane of equality in [illegible] the committee realized that the exceptional con[illegible]Canadian and Mexican borders required exceptional t[illegible]Across the boundary from California, Arizona, New Mexico, [illegible] Texas there are a number of small cities and towns. Across the Canadian border there are a number of important cities and villages. In normal times many of the residents of these Canadian and Mexican cities and towns visit the United States on business or pleasure from time to time.